

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated October 13, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Butman, et al. Independent Claims 1, 12, and 23 recite in general the formation of a boundary traversal key from a connections property table at a client network having information to traverse a boundary device controlling access to a server network. By contrast, the Butman, et al. patent performs its authentication process at a domain communications server through use of a dynamic client registry maintained at the domain communications server. Thus, there is no connection property table at the client side communications server of the Butman, et al. patent as required by the claimed invention. Moreover, the domain communications server of the Butman, et al. patent collects information for a particular client side communication server from other client side communications server. Thus, the particular client side communication server of the Butman, et al. patent is never required to traverse a boundary device controlling access to another client side communications server and thus does not create a boundary traversal key as required by the claimed invention. The portions of the Butman, et al. patent cited by the Examiner and shown in Figure 3 merely illustrates an extension of Figure 1 where domain communications servers are capable of being connected to each other. There is no disclosure in the Butman, et al. patent that the client side communication servers connected to these respective domain communications servers include a connection property table as required in the claimed invention. The domain communications

servers clearly cannot be considered "client side" as they are separated from the client side communications servers by individual firewalls. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-27 are not anticipated by the Butman, et al. patent.

The present Response to Examiner's Final Action is necessary to address the Examiner's current reasons for rejection. This Response to Examiner's Action could not have been presented earlier as the Examiner has only now provided the current reasons for rejecting the claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charles S. Fish', is written over the printed name.

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

December 13, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
073388.0122

PATENT APPLICATION
09/451,699



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Chris K. Wensel
Serial No.: 09/451,699
Filing Date: November 30, 1999
Group Art Unit 2155
Examiner Young N. Won
Title: TRANSPARENT CONNECTION TYPE BINDING
BY ADDRESS RANGE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL

I hereby certify that the attached Response to Examiner's Final Action is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.10 on this 13th day of December 2004, addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Willie Jiles

Willie Jiles

Express Mail Receipt
No. EV 323311446 US